



Granite Bay Community Plan Review

***Granite Bay MAC Meeting
April 7, 2010***

COMMUNITY PLAN REVIEW SURVEY UPDATE

- 244 Community Surveys submitted.
- Approximately 1,000 comments tabulated on the Goals and Policies and suggested criteria for land use changes
- Approximately 4,000 comments tabulated on the proposed land use changes
- Survey results for the Goals and Policies Sections and Criteria for Land Use Changes will be presented tonight
- Survey results for Land Use Change Requests will be presented at the May MAC Meeting.
 1. Continue to meet with property owners
 2. Results will be posted on the County's Website




COMMUNITY SURVEY RESULTS AVAILABLE ONLINE

Placer County Planning Department Website:

<http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/CommunityDevelopment/Planning/GBCPReview.aspx>



 2009 GRANITE BAY COMMUNITY PLAN REVIEW SURVEY SECTION I						
1989 GRANITE BAY GENERAL COMMUNITY PLAN GOALS AND POLICIES (Please provide input on adequacy of existing goals and policies.) (Note: Due to rounding of numbers, percentages may not add up to 100)						
GENERAL COMMUNITY GOALS						
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
TO MANAGE LAND AS A RESOURCE, NOT AS A COMMODITY, SO THAT ITS FUTURE USE WILL BE BENEFICIAL TO THE COMMUNITY.	64%	20%	6%	6%	2%	1%
<p>Comments:</p> <p>1) Vague, ambiguous, and uncertain what is meant!</p> <p>2) Private land should not be controlled</p> <p>13) Resource and Commodity are intertwined</p> <p>27) Existing adequate</p> <p>37) I am against management of privately owned land by the community at large.</p> <p>41) "No growth" policies in Santa Barbara County from 1960s through 1990s left that County without water meters and no hourly workers in Santa Barbara could afford to live in the County.</p> <p>45) None of these responses to be construed as supporting re-opening the existing community plan. The density increase requests are contrary to the general plan.</p> <p>47) Land is a resource and a commodity! Its use should be managed to benefit the community from economic and natural standpoint.</p> <p>51) What is left of Granite Bay needs to be left as natural resources not developed</p> <p>54) This aspect is so important to the identity of our community. We don't want to become another busy city.</p> <p>59) Continue to facilitate land use changes on a per parcel basis through the Granite Bay MAC.</p> <p>64) To certain extent landowners should be able to improve their land and benefit from it.</p> <p>65) Who wouldn't be in favor of all these goals in Section I – unless his goal is to make money from the use of our Granite Bay lands.</p> <p>67) Strongly oppose the Rocklin – Roseville development and growth ideology – No tracts of homes or urban style infill.</p> <p>68) No high density – We moved here for the small town rural feel.</p> <p>76) I grew up here. This is a good place to live. Don't change plan. It doesn't need changing</p>						

SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS

Section I: 1989 Granite Bay Community Plan General Goals



	Agree	Disagree	Neutral/NA
SECTION I			
To Manage Land as a Resource, Not as a Commodity, so That its Future Use Will be Beneficial to the Community.	84.7%	8.5%	6.8%
To Protect and Preserve the Unique Rural Character of the Community and Maintain the Identity of Granite Bay as a Scenic, Tranquil, Family-Oriented Rural/Residential Community Compatible with the Area's Physical Constraints and Natural Features.	80.7%	12.0%	7.3%
To Conserve and Protect, as Valuable Assets to the Community and the County, the Natural and Cultural Resources, the Natural Environment and the Open Space of the Area.	77.2%	10.5%	12.2%
To Conserve the Visual and Aesthetic Resources of the Community, Including Significant Vistas, Woodlands and Grasslands, and Minimize the Disturbance of the Natural Terrain.	74.6%	16.1%	9.3%
To Provide the Civic and Recreational Facilities and Activities Needed by the Community Which Encourage the Interaction of Residents in the Pursuit of Common Interests and Which Result in a Strong Sense of Community Identity.	65.9%	16.4%	17.7%

SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS

Section I: 1989 Granite Bay Community Plan General Goals (Continued)

	Agree	Disagree	Neutral/NA
SECTION I (Cont.)			
To Establish and Maintain a System of Natural Scenic Paths Trails and Roads.			
	77.2%	11.4%	11.4%
To Provide Only Those Commercial, Professional and Institutional Services and Facilities Which are Required to Meet the Frequently Recurring Needs of Residents of the Community and Which are Scaled to Meet Only the Local Residents' Needs.			
	71.7%	19.0%	9.3%
To Subject All New Development, With Potential for Fiscal or Functional Impacts on the Delivery of Public Services, to an Impact Analysis to Avoid Additional Financial Burdens on the Existing Community and to Assure the Continued Availability of the Appropriate Level of Public Services.			
	79.7%	9.9%	10.3%
To Ensure That the Rate of Development Shall Not Exceed the Capacity of the County, Community, Special Districts and Utility Companies to Provide All Needed Services and Facilities in a Timely, Orderly and Economic Manner.			
	82.8%	7.8%	9.5%
To Monitor Growth in the Plan Area, to Identify Trends in the Timing of Different Types of Development in the Various Land Use Categories, to Determine if a Mix of Densities and a Variety of Lot Sizes is Being Maintained Over Time.			
	49.8%	31.6%	18.6%



SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS

Section I: 1989 Granite Bay Community Plan General Policies



	Agree	Disagree	Neutral/NA
SECTION I			
Land Uses in the Granite Bay Community Shall be Compatible With the Community Plan.	74.1%	12.5%	13.4%
Uses of Land in the Granite Bay Community Shall, in General, be Restricted to Residential Sites; Conservation and Open Space Preserves for Watershed Protection, Air Quality Protection, Scenic Enjoyment and Recreation, Agricultural Pursuits and such Public, Private and Commercial Uses as are Necessary to Serve the Frequent Needs of the Community and to Provide Reasonable or Accustomed Services to Local Residents.	73.2%	16.5%	10.3%
The Magnitude and Intensity of Land Use Within the Granite Bay Area Should be Limited by Natural and Other Planning Constraints.	72.9%	11.6%	15.6%
The Population Density Pattern Should be Consistent With the Following: A) Preservation of Natural Terrain, Natural Open Spaces, and Natural Scenic Areas in the Planning Areas; B) the Recognition of the Fact That Certain Areas within the Community are Not Suited for Development Because of Natural Constraints; C) The Role of Granite Bay as a Transition Area Between the Urban Densities in Neighboring Communities to the South and West and the Predominantly Agricultural Communities and Open Space Uses to the North and East.	78.9%	9.3%	11.9%

SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS

Section I: 1989 Granite Bay Community Plan General Policies (Continued)

	Agree	Disagree	Neutral/NA
SECTION I (Cont.)			
Care Shall be Taken in the Development and Use of Lands in the Granite Bay Area to Protect the Community and Downstream Communities Against Excessive Storm Water Runoff, Flooding, Air and Water Pollution, Erosion, Fire, Landslides and other Natural Hazards	77.7%	8.0%	14.3%
Utility Lines and Other Services Shall Not be Extended in Advance of Need.	68.3%	14.8%	17.0%
Public School Buildings and Grounds Shall be Designed and Used as Much as Possible to Serve the Cultural, Civic and Recreational Needs of the Community.	81.8%	6.7%	11.6%
Structures of Historic or Architectural Significance Shall be Identified and Documented, and Efforts Shall be Made to Preserve Them.	69.0%	8.8%	22.1%
Fees Will be Charged to New Development to Help Offset Fiscal, Functional or Environmental Impacts to the Community.	76.7%	11.5%	11.9%



SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS

Section II: Community Proposed Policy Changes

Community proposed policies with strong support with at least 65% of the respondents answering either Strongly Agree/Agree or Strongly Disagree/Disagree:

1. Spot Zoning Should not be allowed (82%)
2. Residential Lot Sizes Should Vary in Size to Preserve the Rural Character of Granite Bay (81%)
3. Provide Current/Updated Population Figures (76%)
4. The Rural Residential Quality of the Granite Bay area should be preserved (73%)
5. Limit Senior Housing Developments to Single-Story (69%)
6. Limit "Pass Through" Traffic in Local Neighborhoods (68%)
7. The 300' Ssetback Requirement Should Remain in place for residential properties along the south side of Douglas Boulevard (67%)
8. Limit new commercial uses along Douglas Boulevard (66%)
9. Large churches and Community Centers should be limited in size (65%)



SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS

Section II: Community Proposed Policy Changes

Community proposed policies which received the greatest number of comments:

1. Housing Needs (i.e. Retirement. Low -Income, etc) within Granite Bay Should be Revaluated (44)
2. The Plan should Identify Areas for Medium/High Density Residential Uses Based on Proximity to Public Services and Transportation Networks (44)
3. Large Churches and Community Centers in Granite Bay Should be Limited in Size (41)
4. In an effort to attract businesses and create successful commercial centers, offer incentives to revitalize existing commercial areas (i.e. Sierra College Blvd, Douglas Blvd, and Auburn-Folsom Road) (38)
5. Assumptions About Agriculture Uses Within the Existing Granite Bay Community Plan Should be Reviewed (37)
6. The Community Guidelines For Granite Bay Should be Updated (37)
7. Limit New Commercial Along Douglas Boulevard (36)
8. Limit Senior Housing Development to Single-Story (35)
9. Residential Lot Sizes Should Vary in Size to Preserve the Rural Character of Granite Bay (35)



SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS

Section II: Community Proposed Policy Changes

Most common type of comments received throughout the written comment section:

1. "Discourage high density and/or low-income housing."
2. "Keep the current Plan" – "Leave the Plan as is".
3. "No need to expand commercial areas"
4. "Maintain the 300 foot setback along Douglas."
5. "Preserve Granite Bay's rural character"
6. "There is too much traffic"



SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS

Section III: Suggested Criteria for Evaluating Land Use Requests

	Agree	Disagree	Neutral/NA
SECTION III			
Availability of Sewer			
	84.4%	9.5%	6.1%
Availability of Water			
	93.3%	3.3%	3.3%
Land Use Compatibility With Adjacent Properties			
	91.4%	5.7%	2.9%
Lot Size Compatibility			
	84.1%	8.0%	8.0%
Consideration of Environmental Constraints (Oak Woodlands, Wetlands, Floodplains, etc.)			
	85.0%	7.5%	7.5%
Should the Project Provide a Community Benefit (i.e. Fiscal, Social, Cultural)?			
	66.1%	9.1%	24.8%





- Check-in with the Board of Supervisors on April 27, 2010.
- Presentation of Community Survey Results for Land Use Change Requests at May 5, 2010 Granite Bay MAC Meeting